



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,311	04/11/2006	Nicola Anne Burgess	13001015PCTUS	5452

23565 7590 12/05/2006

KLAUBER & JACKSON
411 HACKENSACK AVENUE
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601

EXAMINER

GUSSOW, ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1643

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/575,311	Applicant(s) BURGESS, NICOLA ANNE	
	Examiner Anne M. Gussow	Art Unit 1643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

To have a general inventive concept under PCT rule 13.1, the inventions need to be linked by a special technical feature. The special technical feature recited in claim 1 is a pharmaceutical composition comprising an agent that interacts with a CDCP1 polypeptide. In view of this Buehring, et al. reads on the claim. Buehring, et al. teach antibodies that bind CDCP1 (paragraphs 62-63 and 73-74). Therefore the technical feature recited in claim 1 is not special. Accordingly the groups are not so linked as to form a single general concept under rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1 in part, 2-3, 6, and 26, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition that interacts with CDCP1.

Group II, claim(s) 1 in part, 2-3, 6, and 26, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition that modulates the expression or activity of a CDCP1 polypeptide.

Group III, claim(s) 4-5 and 27, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising a CDCP1 polypeptide. If this composition is further defined as containing an antibody it may be subject to further restriction.

Group VI, claim(s) 7-12, drawn to a method of treatment or prophylaxis of ovarian cancer.

Art Unit: 1643

Group V, claim(s) 13-14, 24-25, drawn to a method of screening for anti-ovarian cancer agents that interact with a CDCP1 polypeptide.

Group VI, claim(s) 15-17, drawn to a method of screening for anti-ovarian cancer agents that modulate expression or activity of a CDCP1 polypeptide.

Group VII, claim(s) 18, drawn to an agent identified by screening for anti-ovarian cancer agents with a CDCP1 polypeptide. This agent may be subject to further restriction when it is further defined. If the agent is an antibody, this group will be combined with Group I.

Group VIII, claim(s) 19-23, drawn to a method of screening for and/or diagnosis or prognosis of ovarian cancer.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: As set forth above, in view of the teaching of Buehring, et al., the groups are not so linked as to form a single general concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because the technical feature of claim 1 is not special.

Inventions of Groups I, II, III, and VII represent separate and distinct products which are made by materially different methods, and are used in materially different methods which have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. The antibodies of Groups I and II, the protein product of Group III, and the agent of Group VII are all structurally and chemically different from each other. The polypeptide is made by translation of mRNA, while the antibody is raised by immunization and the unidentified agent would be translated from mRNA that differed from the mRNA encoding the polypeptide, if the agent is a polypeptide. Furthermore, the polypeptide can be used for methods of treatment, the antibody can be used to

Art Unit: 1643

immunopurify the polypeptide and the agent can be used for different methods of treatment to up-regulate and down-regulate the polypeptide in a clinical setting, for example. The examination of all groups would require different searches in the U.S. Patent shoes and the scientific literature and would require the consideration of different patentability issues. Thus the inventions I, II, III, and VII are patentably distinct.

The methods of Inventions IV-VI and VIII differ in the method objectives, method steps and parameters and in the reagents used. Invention IV recites treatment using an agent that interacts with or modulates a CDCP1 polypeptide; Invention V recites screening for agents that interact with a CDCP1 polypeptide; Invention VI recites screening for agents that modulate expression or activity of a CDCP1 polypeptide; and Invention VIII recites screening for diagnosis or prognosis of ovarian cancer in a subject. The examination of all groups would require different searches in the U.S. PATENT shoes and the scientific literature and would require the consideration of different patentability issues. Thus Inventions IV-VI and VIII are separate and distinct in having different method steps and different endpoints and are patentably distinct.

Inventions I-III and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the products of Groups I, II and III could interchangeably be used in the treatment method of Group IV.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

4. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Art Unit: 1643

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Gussow whose telephone number is (571) 272-6047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on (571) 272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER